

1 LIZABETH A. LEEDS  
2 *Appearing Pro Hac Vice*  
3 Florida Bar No.:00457991  
4 Chief of Multistate Enforcement  
5 ELI A. FRIEDMAN  
6 Assistant Attorney General  
7 Florida Bar No.:0518476  
8 Office of the Attorney General  
9 PL-01 The Capitol  
10 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1050  
11 Telephone: (850) 414-3300  
12 Fax: (850) 488-9134  
13 Email: Liz.Leeds@myfloridalegal.com  
14 Eli.Friedman@myfloridalegal.com

15 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
16 STATE OF FLORIDA  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, *et. al*,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

INFINEON TECHNOLOGIES AG, *et. al.*,

Defendants.

) Case No.: C 06-04333 PJH

) Assigned for all purposes to the  
) Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton

) **PLAINTIFF STATE OF FLORIDA'S**  
) **NOTICE OF MOTION AND**  
) **MOTION TO STRIKE**

) **ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED**

) Hearing date:  
) Time: 9:00 a.m.  
) Courtroom: 3, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
) Judge: Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. THE “MACK AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE” SHOULD BE STRICKEN BECAUSE MACK, WHICH IS VALID AND CONTROLLING, PROVIDES STANDING TO INDIRECT PURCHASERS UNDER FLORIDA LAW .....	2
II. THE “FDUTPA AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES” SHOULD BE STRICKEN BECAUSE THE FLORIDA DECEPTIVE AND UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES ACT PERMITS UNFAIR COMPETITION CLAIMS FOR PRICE-FIXING BY INDIRECT PURCHASERS.....	4
CONCLUSION.....	6

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

## Cases

<i>Butler v. Adoption Media, LLC</i> , No C. 04-0135 PJH, 2005 U.S. Dist. Lexis 46208.....	2
<i>Erie R.R. Co. v. Tompkins</i> , 304 U.S. 64 (1938).....	3
<i>FTC v. Mylan Labs., Inc.</i> , 62 F. Supp. 2d 25 (D.D.C. 1999).....	3,4
<i>Fidelity Union Trust Co. v. Field</i> , 311 U.S. 1669, 177-78 (1940).....	3
<i>Fantasy Inc. v. Fogerty</i> , 984 F.2d 1524, 1527 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993).....	2
<i>Mack v. Bristol Myers Squibb Co.</i> , 673 So.2d 100 (FLA. 1 <sup>st</sup> DCA 1996).....	2,3,4,5
<i>Pardo v. Florida</i> , 596 So.2d 665, 666 (Fla, 1992).....	3
<i>Sidney-Vinstein v. A.H. Robins Co.</i> , 697 F.2d 880, 885 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983) .....	2
<i>Stanfill v. Florida</i> , 384 So.2d 141, 143 (Fla. 1980).....	3
<i>United Mine Workers v. Gibbs</i> , 383 U.S. 7105 (1966).....	3
<i>Weinman v. McHaffie</i> , 470 So.2d 682, 684 (Fla. 1985).....	3

## Statutes

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f).....	2
FLA. STAT. § 501(2008).....	4,5
FLA. STAT. § 542 (2008) .....	4

**PLAINTIFF STATE OF FLORIDA'S NOTICE OF MOTION**  
**AND MOTION TO STRIKE**

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(f), the Plaintiff State of Florida will and hereby does move to strike, in part, Defendants' Affirmative Defenses to Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint. This motion shall be heard on August 6, 2008 at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be called, in the courtroom of the Honorable Phyllis J. Hamilton, United States District Judge, United States District Court, 450 Golden Gate Ave., San Francisco, California, 94102.

This motion is based upon this Notice of Motion; the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities; the complete files in this action, including Defendants' Affirmative Defenses; argument of counsel; and other such and further matters as this Court may consider.

DATED:

July 2, 2008

Respectfully Submitted,  
STATE OF FLORIDA

/s/ Lizabeth Leeds  
Lizabeth A. Leeds  
Eli A. Friedman

Attorneys for the  
State of Florida

**MOTION TO STRIKE SEVERAL OF DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE  
DEFENSES RELATING TO THE STATE OF FLORIDA**

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

Plaintiff State of Florida (Florida) respectfully submits this memorandum of points and authorities in support of its Motion to Strike.

**INTRODUCTION**

On May 13, Defendants filed with this Court Answers and numerous Affirmative Defenses to Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint. A number of Defendants' Affirmative Defenses misstate and misconstrue the current state of both Florida and federal law and therefore should be stricken.<sup>1</sup> This motion requests that this Court strike NEC Electronics America Inc.'s sixty-ninth Affirmative Defense (The *Mack* Affirmative Defense). Additionally, Florida moves to strike Elpida Memory, Inc.'s and Elpida Memory (USA) Inc.'s sixtieth Affirmative Defense, Hynix's sixty-second Affirmative Defense, Infineon Technologies North American Corp. and Infineon Technologies AG's forty-third Affirmative Defense, Micron Technology Inc.'s and Micron Semiconductor Products, Inc.'s forty-third Additional Defense, Nanya Technology Corporation's Affirmative Defenses eleven and sixty-four, Nanya Technology Corporation USA's Affirmative Defenses eleven and sixty-four, and NEC Electronics America Inc.'s sixty-seventh Affirmative Defense. (The FDUTPA Affirmative Defenses)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Plaintiff State of Florida specifically reserves its right to contest all of Defendants' Affirmative Defenses at a later date.

<sup>2</sup> For the convenience of the Court, Florida has attached an appendix of the specific Affirmative Defenses that are the subject of this motion. Additionally, Defendants' Affirmative Defenses each adopt and incorporate the Affirmative Defenses of all of the other Defendants, and therefore each section of this motion to strike includes each

I. STANDARD

Florida brings this motion to strike the *Mack* Affirmative Defense and the FDUTPA Affirmative Defenses because they are legally insufficient. “Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(f) provides that the court ‘may order stricken from any pleading any insufficient defense.’” *Butler v. Adoption Media, LLC*, No. C 04-0135 PJH, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 46208 (N.D. Cal. June 21, 2005) (quoting the 2005 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure) (granting, in part, plaintiffs’ motions to strike when defendants’ affirmative defenses were legally insufficient). The essential function of a Rule 12(f) motion is to “avoid the expenditure of time and money that must arise from litigating spurious issues by dispensing with those issues prior to trial . . . .” *Fantasy, Inc. v. Fogerty*, 984 F.2d 1524, 1527 (9th Cir. 1993), *rev’d on other grounds*, 510 U.S. 517 (1994) (quoting *Sidney-Vinstein v. A.H. Robins Co.*, 697 F.2d 880, 885 (9th Cir. 1983)).

II. THE MACK AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE SHOULD BE STRICKEN BECAUSE MACK, WHICH IS VALID AND CONTROLLING, PROVIDES STANDING TO INDIRECT PURCHASERS UNDER FLORIDA LAW.

The *Mack* Affirmative Defense

avers that Plaintiff’s claims are barred, in whole or in part, to the extent that Plaintiff, or those on whose behalf Plaintiff purports to bring the Complaint, alleged standing rests upon the First District Court of Appeal’s holding in *Mack v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.*, 673 So. 2d 100 (Fla. 1<sup>st</sup> DCA 1996). That case is not controlling on this Court, and was wrongly decided.

See NEC Electronics America, Inc.’s Answer to Third Am. Compl. at 57.

---

Defendant, including Mosel Vitelic Inc. and Mosel Vitelic Corporation, to the extent they have adopted the challenged affirmative defenses.

1        *Mack*, the rule of law in Florida, provides standing to indirect purchasers and under  
2 applicable legal principles should be considered controlling by this Court. In the absence of  
3 interdistrict conflict, district court decisions bind all Florida trial courts and, as to substantive  
4 law claims, are therefore also binding on this Court.  
5

6        *Mack v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.* was decided by Florida's First District Court of Appeal  
7 in 1996. Since *Mack* was decided no other Florida district court decision has been rendered that  
8 is in conflict with *Mack*. The Florida Supreme Court has repeatedly held that "the decisions of  
9 the district courts of appeal represent the law of Florida unless and until they are overruled by  
10 this Court." *Pardo v. Florida*, 596 So. 2d 665, 666 (Fla. 1992) (quoting *Stanfill v. Florida*, 384  
11 So. 2d 141, 143 (Fla. 1980)). Consequently, in the absence of interdistrict conflict, a district  
12 court decision binds all Florida trial courts. *Id.* (citing *Weiman v. McHaffie*, 470 So. 2d 682,  
13 684 (Fla. 1985)).  
14  
15

16        Moreover, the United States Supreme Court has found that "[a]n intermediate state  
17 court in declaring and applying the state law is acting as an organ of the State and its  
18 determination, in the absence of more convincing evidence of what the state law is, should be  
19 followed by a federal court in deciding a state question." *Fidelity Union Trust Co. v. Field*, 311  
20 U.S. 169, 177-78 (1940), *cited in FTC v. Mylan Labs., Inc.*, 62 F. Supp. 2d 25 (D.D.C. 1999).  
21

22        When a federal court sits in diversity jurisdiction over a state law claim it must apply  
23 state substantive law in resolving the dispute. *Erie R.R. Co. v. Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64 (1938).  
24 When a federal court sits in pendent, or supplemental, jurisdiction it must apply the rule of  
25 *Erie*. *United Mine Workers v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715 (1966).  
26  
27  
28

1 Because *Mack* is controlling law throughout Florida, when considering Florida's  
2 substantive law claims, this Court should consider it controlling as mandated by United States  
3 Supreme Court precedent. *See, e.g. Fidelity Union Trust, Erie and United Mine Workers.*  
4

5  
6  
7 III. THE "FDUTPA AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES" SHOULD BE STRICKEN  
8 BECAUSE THE FLORIDA DECEPTIVE AND UNFAIR TRADE  
9 PRACTICES ACT PERMITS UNFAIR COMPETITION CLAIMS FOR  
10 PRICE-FIXING BY  
11 INDIRECT PURCHASERS.

12 The FDUTPA Affirmative Defenses aver that Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or  
13 in part, because, pursuant to Fla. Stat. § 501.202(3), FDUTPA must be construed in a manner  
14 consistent with federal antitrust laws. Because Plaintiffs' injuries are too speculative,  
15 derivative, indirect, and remote to confer standing under federal antitrust law, they also do not  
16 confer standing under FDUTPA. *See, e.g. Answer of Def. Infineon Technologies North*  
17 *America Corp. and Infineon Technologies AG to Third Am. Comp. at 62.*

18 *Mack*, the rule of law in Florida, provides standing to indirect purchasers under  
19 FDUTPA, section 501, through a cause of action that is completely independent of the Florida  
20 Antitrust Act, section 542.

21 According to *Mack*, "[a] fair reading of section 501.211 reveals no intention by the  
22 legislature to limit suits for price-fixing to direct purchasers only." 673 So. 2d at 105. Section  
23 501.211 describes, in part, the individual remedies available under the FDUTPA. The *Mack*  
24 court found that "[p]ermitting indirect purchasers to sue under the Florida DTPA effectuates  
25 the consumer protection policies of the Florida DTPA, but is not adverse to the purposes of the  
26 Antitrust Act." *Id.* at 110.  
27  
28



1 This reading of *Mack* is not limited to Florida courts. At least one federal court has  
2 applied *Mack* to the facts before it and found it to be controlling. In *FTC v. Mylan Labs., Inc.*,  
3 the court found that Florida indirect purchasers have standing under the FDUTPA, even though  
4 they did not have standing to sue under either the federal or Florida antitrust laws. 62 F. Supp.  
5 2d 25, 46-47 (D.D.C. 1999) (following the holding in *Mack v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.*). In  
6 *Mylan*,

8 The Court [did] not dismiss Florida's claim seeking damages for indirect purchasers  
9 under the FDUTPA. Although allowing such a claim increases the risk of duplicative  
10 recovery as discussed above, the Florida Court of Appeals has specifically held that an  
11 indirect purchaser has standing to bring a suit for damages under the FDUTPA.

12 *Id.* at 46.

13 Florida statute § 501.202(3) does not, as Defendants' state in the FDUTPA Affirmative  
14 Defenses, require that FDUTPA be construed in a manner consistent with federal antitrust law.

15 Rather, it states that "The provisions of this part shall be construed liberally to promote  
16 the following policies:....(3) To make state consumer protection and enforcement consistent  
17 with established policies of federal law relating to *consumer protection*(emphasis added)."

18 Contrary to Defendants' assertions, no court has held that a claim under FDUTPA must  
19 "be construed in a manner consistent with federal antitrust laws." See FDUTPA Affirmative  
20 Defenses. In fact, as discussed above, both the state and federal courts that addressed this issue  
21 held that antitrust standing was not required under FDUTPA.

22 In this case, the State of Florida has asserted clearly permissible FDUTPA substantive  
23 law claims under Florida law on behalf of indirect purchasers. Under the supplemental  
24 jurisdiction of this Court, the rule of *Mack* should be followed and Defendants' FDUTPA  
25 Affirmative Defenses should be stricken.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully submit that this motion to strike be granted without prejudice.

DATED: July 2, 2008

Respectfully Submitted,  
STATE OF FLORIDA

/s/ Lizabeth Leeds  
Lizabeth A. Leeds  
Eli A. Friedman

Attorneys for the  
State of Florida

**APPENDIX A**

**FDUTPA AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

**ELPIDA MEMORY, INC. AND ELPIDA MEMORY (USA) INC.**

**SIXTIETH DEFENSE**

Plaintiffs' claims under Fla. Stat. §§ 501.201, *et seq.* are barred, in whole or in part, because pursuant to Fla. Stat. § 501.202(3), the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act ("FDUTPA") must be construed in a manner consistent with federal antitrust laws. Because Plaintiffs' injuries are too speculative, derivative, indirect and remote to confer standing under federal antitrust law, they also do not confer standing under FDUTPA.

**HYNIX SEMICONDUCTOR INC. AND HYNIX**

**SEMICONDUCTOR AMERICA INC.**

**SIXTY-SECOND DEFENSE**

Plaintiffs' claims under Florida Stat. 501.201 *et seq.* are barred, in whole or in part, because, pursuant to section 501.202(3), the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act ("FDUTPA") must be construed in a manner consistent with federal antitrust laws. Because Plaintiffs' injuries are too speculative, derivative, indirect and remote to confer standing under federal antitrust law, they also do not confer standing under FDUTPA.

**INFINEON TECHNOLOGIES NORTH AMERICA CORP.**

**AND INFINEON TECHNOLOGIES AG**

**FORTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

Plaintiffs' claims under Florida Stat. §§ 501.201 *et seq.* are barred, in whole or in part, because pursuant to § 501.202(3), the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act

1 (“FDUTPA”) must be construed in a manner consistent with federal antitrust laws. Because  
 2 Plaintiffs’ injuries are too speculative, derivative, indirect and remote to confer standing under  
 3 federal antitrust law, they also do not confer standing under FDUTPA.  
 4

5 **MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC. AND MICRON**  
 6 **SEMICONDUCTOR PRODUCTS, INC.**  
 7 **FORTY-THIRD ADDITIONAL DEFENSE**

8 Plaintiffs’ claims under Florida Stat. §§ 501.201 *et seq.* are barred, in whole or in part,  
 9 because pursuant to § 501.202(3), the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act  
 10 (“FDUTPA”) must be construed in a manner consistent with federal antitrust laws. Because  
 11 Plaintiffs’ injuries are too speculative, derivative, indirect and remote to confer standing under  
 12 federal antitrust law, they also do not confer standing under FDUTPA.  
 13

14 **NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION**

15 11. The laws of various states (including, without limitation, Florida Stat.  
 16 § 501.202(3)) must be construed in a manner consistent with federal antitrust law. Because  
 17 Plaintiffs’ alleged injuries are too speculative, derivative, indirect and remote to confer  
 18 standing under federal antitrust law, they also do not confer standing under state law.  
 19

20  
 21 64. Plaintiffs’ claims under Florida Stat. §§ 501.201, *et seq.*, are barred, in  
 22 whole or in part, because pursuant to § 501.202(3), the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade  
 23 Practices Act (“FDUTPA”) must be construed in a manner consistent with federal antitrust  
 24 laws. Because Plaintiffs’ injuries are too speculative, derivative, indirect and remote to confer  
 25 standing under federal antitrust law, they also do not confer standing under FDUTPA.  
 26  
 27  
 28

**NANYA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION USA**

11. The laws of various states (including, without limitation, Florida Stat. § 501.202(3)) must be construed in a manner consistent with federal antitrust law. Because Plaintiffs' alleged injuries are too speculative, derivative, indirect and remote to confer standing under federal antitrust law, they also do not confer standing under state law.

64. Plaintiffs' claims under Florida Stat. §§ 501.201, *et seq.*, are barred, in whole or in part, because pursuant to § 501.202(3), the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act ("FDUTPA") must be construed in a manner consistent with federal antitrust laws. Because Plaintiffs' injuries are too speculative, derivative, indirect and remote to confer standing under federal antitrust law, they also do not confer standing under FDUTPA.

**NEC ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.'S  
SIXTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE  
(Lack of Standing Under FDUTPA)**

67. As a sixty-seventh and separate affirmative defense, with respect to the State of Florida, NEC avers that Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, because, pursuant to Fla. Stat. § 501.202(3), the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act ("FDUTPA") must be construed in a manner consistent with federal antitrust laws. Because Plaintiffs' injuries are too speculative, derivative, indirect, and remote to confer standing under federal antitrust law, they also do not confer standing under FDUTPA.

**MACK AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

**NEC ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.'S  
SIXTY-NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

**(Lack of Standing Based on *Mack*)**

69. As a sixty-ninth and separate affirmative defense, with respect to the State of Florida, NEC avers that Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, to the extent that Plaintiff, or those on whose behalf Plaintiff purports to bring the Complaint, alleged standing rests upon the First District Court of Appeal's holding in *Mack v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.*, 673 So. 2d 100 (Fla. 1st DCA 1996). That case is not controlling on this Court, and was wrongly decided.

**DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY U.S. MAIL**

Case Name: **State of California et al, v. Infineon Technologies AG et al.**

No.: **C-06-4333 SC**

I declare:

I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General, which is the office of a member of the Florida State Bar, at which member's direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter. I am familiar with the business practice at the Office of the Attorney General for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. In accordance with that practice, correspondence placed in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business.

On July 2, 2008, I served the attached Motion to Strike by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the internal mail collection system at the Office of the Attorney General at PL-01 The Capitol, Tallahassee, FL 32399-1050, addressed as follows:

1 **Harrison Frahn, IV, Esq.**

2 Simpson Thacher

3 2550 Hanover Street

4 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1115

5 Phone: 650-251-5000

6 Fax: 650-251-5002

7 email: [hfrahn@stblaw.com](mailto:hfrahn@stblaw.com)

8 Attorneys for Elpida Memory, Inc.

9 and Elpida Memory (USA) Inc.

11 **Michael F. Tubach, Esq.**

12 O'Melveny & Myers LLP

13 Embarcadero Center West

14 275 Battery Street

15 San Francisco, CA 94111-3305

16 Phone: 415-984-8876

17 Fax: 415-984-8701

18 email: [mtubach@omm.com](mailto:mtubach@omm.com)

19 Attorneys for Defendant Hynix Semiconductor America



1 **Steve H. Bergman, Esq.**

2 **Kenneth Ryan O'Rourke, Esq.**

3 **Jane Y. Chang, Esq.**

4 O'Melveny & Myers LLP

5 400 South Hope Street

6 Los Angeles, CA 90071

7 Phone: 213-430-7653

8 Fax: 213-430-6407

9 Email: sbergman@omm.com

10 korourke@omm.com

11 jchang@omm.com

12 Attorneys for Hynix Semiconductor, Inc.

14 **Florence Beauboeuf, Esq.**

15 O'Melveny & Myers LLP

16 Times Square Tower

17 7 Times Square

18 New York, New York 10036

19 Phone: 212-326-4486

20 Fax: 212-326-2061

21 Email: fbeauboeuf@omm.com

22 Attorneys for Hynix Semiconductor, Inc.

1 **Joshua Stewart Stambaugh, Esq.**

2 **Julian Brew, Esq.**

3 Kaye Scholer, LLP

4 1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1700

5 Los Angeles CA 90067-6048

6 Phone: 310-788-1244

7 Fax: 310-788-1205

8 Email: [jstambaugh@kayescholer.com](mailto:jstambaugh@kayescholer.com)

9 Email: [jbrew@kayescholer.com](mailto:jbrew@kayescholer.com)

10 Attorneys for Infineon Technologies North America Corp.

11 and Infineon Technologies AG

12  
13 **Howard M. Ullman, Esq.**

14 Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP

15 The Orrick Building

16 405 Howard Street

17 San Francisco, CA 94105-2669

18 Phone: 415-773-5652

19 Fax: 415-773-5759

20 email: [hullman@orrick.com](mailto:hullman@orrick.com)

21 Attorneys for Nanya Technology Corp.

22 and Nanya Technology Corp. USA

1 **Paul R. Griffin, Esq.**

2 **Jonathan E. Swartz, Esq.**

3 Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP

4 101 Second Street, Suite 1800

5 San Francisco, CA 94105

6 Phone: 415-371-1200

7 Fax: 415-371-1211

8 email: [pgriffin@thelenreid.com](mailto:pgriffin@thelenreid.com)

9 [jswartz@thelenreid.com](mailto:jswartz@thelenreid.com)

10 Attorneys for NEC Electronics America,

11  
12 **Gary L. Halling, Esq.**

13 Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton

14 Four Embarcadero Ctr., 17th Fl.

15 San Francisco, CA 94111

16 Phone: 415-774-3234

17 Fax: 415-371-1211

18 email: [ghalling@sheppardmullin.com](mailto:ghalling@sheppardmullin.com)

19 Attorneys for Samsung Electronics America, Inc.

20  
21 **Steven H. Morrisett, Esq.**

22 Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner

23 3300 Hillview Avenue

24 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1203

25 Phone: 650-849-6624

26 Fax: 650-849-6666

27 email: [morrisett@finnegan.com](mailto:morrisett@finnegan.com)

28 Attorneys for Winbond Electronics Corp. America

1  
2 **Joshua David Hess, Esq.**

3 **G. Charles Nierlich, Esq.**

4 **Joel Sanders, Esq.**

5 Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher

6 One Montgomery Street, Suite 3100

7 San Francisco, CA 94104

8 Phone: 415-393-8200

9 Fax: 415-986-5309

10 Email: [jhess@gibsondunn.com](mailto:jhess@gibsondunn.com)

11 Email: [cnierlich@gibsondunn.com](mailto:cnierlich@gibsondunn.com)

12 Email: [jsanders@gibsondunn.com](mailto:jsanders@gibsondunn.com)

13 <mailto:jhess@gibsondunn.com> Attorneys for Micron Technology, Inc.

14 Semiconductor Products, Inc.

15  
16  
17  
18 **Aaron M. Armstrong, Esq.**

19 **David C. Brownstein, Esq.**

20 Heller, Ehrman, White & McAuliffe

21 333 Bush Street, 30<sup>th</sup> Floor

22 San Francisco, CA 94104-2878

23 Phone: 415-772-6000

24 Fax: 415-772-6268

25 Email: [aaron.armstrong@hellerehrman.com](mailto:aaron.armstrong@hellerehrman.com)

26 [david.brownstein@hellerehrman.com](mailto:david.brownstein@hellerehrman.com)

27 Attorneys for Mosel Vitelic, Inc.. and Mosel Vitelic, Inc.

1  
2  
3 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Florida the foregoing is true  
4 and correct and that this declaration was executed on July 2, 2008, at Tallahassee, Florida.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Jennifer Morgan-Byrd

11   
Signature  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28